

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JAMES H. HAYES,

Case No. 2:20-cv-02122-RFB-BNW

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, et al.,

Defendants.

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Status Check (ECF No. 94). The Court need only address the issue of service on Defendants William Rowles, Michael Dickerson, E. Varsin, A. Fox, L Jex, and D. McElroy.

When Plaintiff drafted his first amended complaint, ECF No. 50, he failed to follow the instructions on the form for filing civil rights complaints which instructs, on page 2, "if you are naming more than five (5) defendants" you must make a copy of that page and use it in the complaint to provide the information for all the defendants in the required format. Instead, Plaintiff named six defendants through page 3, and continued on with section B "Nature of the Case" through page 5. On page 6, Plaintiff began to name defendants again, beginning with Clark County which it had already named as a Defendant, and intermingled the names of new defendants with already named defendants. Also, Plaintiff only identified six defendants in the caption of the amended complaint. Due to the confusing organization of his complaint, both the Clerk's Office and the Court failed to identify that Plaintiff intended to name Rowles, Dickerson, Varsin, Fox, Jex and McElroy as defendants.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion at ECF No. 94 is **GRANTED**, consistent with this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court add these six additional defendants as named defendants on the docket of the case.

Case 2:20-cv-02122-RFB-BNW Document 95 Filed 03/19/24 Page 2 of 2

27

28